

# **TRANSFERS, CIRCULATION OF NORMS AND REGIONAL PRODUCTION OF PUBLIC POLICIES IN LATIN AMERICA THE CASE OF RURAL TERRITORIAL POLICIES**

**MASSARDIER Gilles**  
CIRAD  
Montpellier  
[gilles.massardier@cirad.fr](mailto:gilles.massardier@cirad.fr)

**SABOURIN Eric**  
CIRAD  
Brasilia  
[eric.sabourin@cirad.fr](mailto:eric.sabourin@cirad.fr)

**Abstract:** *This article sets out to investigate the concept of globalization, through the specificity of the processes involved in the internationalization of Rural Territorial Development (RTD) policies in Latin America, in terms of policy transfers, regionalization, notably “bottom up”, and of transnational circulation of public policy models. In theoretical terms, it is a matter of comparing the world politics approach with public action sociology. This project starts out from the observation that national RTD policies in Latin America have recently seen noteworthy and almost simultaneous expansion with the rapid dissemination of common models and references, but giving rise to diverse national and territorial interpretations. The complexity of the internationalization or regionalization processes observed raises questions again about conventional globalization approaches: Is it possible to speak about globalization of these policies? Or are we, rather, faced with an overlapping of internationalization processes: policy transfers, circulation of models, regional and multi-level governance? The project therefore puts forward three main hypotheses: 1. The first is that of the existence of Latin American macro-regional models for these public policies. 2. The second is that of the overlapping of three internationalization processes for these policies: i) inter/transnational circulation of norms, especially via international organizations and arenas; ii) policy transfers; iii) a “bottom up” regionalization process. 3. The third hypothesis is that of atypical regionalization of this continent which, with and alongside conventional intergovernmental regionalization, is undergoing a process of internationalized sectoral public policy dissemination. The general purpose of the paper is therefore to understand the types of overlapping existing between these internationalization processes and the ways RTD policies are nationally, regionally and territorially adapted in Latin America.*

**Keywords:** *circulation of public policies, territorial development, regionalization, Latin America*

# **TRANSFERS, CIRCULATION OF NORMS AND REGIONAL PRODUCTION OF PUBLIC POLICIES IN LATIN AMERICA THE CASE OF RURAL TERRITORIAL POLICIES**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This paper focuses on the guidelines of a research project currently being drawn up. It therefore takes the form of a theoretical and methodological guide, based on a review of the literature and the compilation of initial empirical elements.

It proposes to discuss the ‘global governance’ concept by cross-analysing: i) international relations ii) an analysis of policies and public action (policy process) iii) the internationalization of public policies (PP), which is a major aspect in the transformation of the policy process. By internationalization, we mean here the relatively recent process whereby the PP production line, which was once exclusively national, is stretched across national boundaries.

The idea here is to show the limitations of an approach in “globalization” terms, notably of a “hyperglobalist” posture (McGrew, 2011, p. 16), taken as being “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (Giddens, 1990, p. 21), and of “de-territorialization” (Scholte, 2000, p. 46): definitions that unfortunately erase sub-global scale stakeholders and political processes. Whilst it is clear that the distinction between “domestic” and “international” needs to be reviewed, State and territorial dynamics nonetheless take on considerable importance in the policy process. Furthermore, this paper seeks to draw attention to the fact that, on the Latin American continent, a regional dimension is taking shape between territory, state and international.

Empirically, the research project, for which this paper is seeking to construct the theoretical framework, focuses on the internationalization of Rural Territorial Development (RTD) programmes. This subject is ideal for observing the phenomenon whereby the policy process is stretched from international to territories, and vice versa<sup>1</sup>.

To that end, the paper sits at the crossroads of six approaches and literatures explaining the international “new regulation” of PPs:

- 1) The approach in terms of world politics and transnationalization of PPs (Rosenau, 1995, 1997; Risse-Kappen, 1995), for which globalization, of national economies in particular, is only one of the factors in this new regulation.
- 2) The approach in terms of policy transfers (Dolowitz & Marsh, 2000; Evans, 2004) and of inter/transnational and circulatory production of national PP paradigms and instruments that rehabilitate the role of States and of national elites in the concert of world politics, beyond just their ability to import instruments for the globalization of the economy (the famous structural adjustments) in their country.
- 3) The approach in terms of regionalization, notably that which consists in observing “bottom up” the production of regional dynamics (Pasquier 2004; Kholer-Koch, 1995).
- 4) The approach in terms of PP territorialization (and not “localization” in Rosenau’s sense (1997 : 81)), i.e. the restricting of stakeholder views and practices to the local territory alone.
- 5) Liberal inter-governmentalism (Moravcsik, 1995) which reinjects national stakeholders into the strategies drawn up by State players, who are still clearly present on the international stage.
- 6) Multi-level governance (Bache, Flinders, 2004; Hoogue, Marks, 2001).

---

<sup>1</sup> The continental dissemination of this RTD policy will be analysed using references in various countries of Latin America and their national expression in three countries: Brazil, Costa Rica and Nicaragua. Atypical Latin American regionalization will be examined through three specific entities: the ECADERT strategic platform in Central America, the PROCISUR programme and Mercosur’s FOCEM regional fund for the southern cone.

The purpose of this paper is therefore to propose a model for analysing the overlapping processes between internationalization, national adaptation, regionalization and territorialization of rural development policies in Latin America.

Five working hypotheses are put forward here:

- 1/ RTD policy provides a glimpse of PP and public action models that are specifically Latin American.
- 2/ These Latin American PP models are constructed by coalitions and by multi-level brokers.
- 3/ By cross-analysing the literature pertaining to world politics with an analysis of public policies and public action, it is possible to take seriously the hypothesis of the overlapping of the different international logics: regionalizations, PP transfers, circulations of paradigms, multilevel interactions.
- 4/ The appearance can be seen of an odd regionalization process made up of assemblages, innovations and, especially, disseminations of sectoral Latin American PP models. One of the strong hypotheses supported here is the existence of regionalization specific to Latin America, which stands out from classic regional intergovernmental integration, and is based on sectorial policy making that is disseminated on a continental level (multi-level circulation of ideas, experiences, stakeholders), all of which is incorporated into the previously described context.
- 5/ However, these models are applied in a variety of non-converging adoptions: regionalization takes place “bottom up”. Echoing these transfers, it seems appropriate to examine the ways in which the recipients take on board or adapt the models depending on national conditions and constraints, and how some references that claim to be universal either fit in, or not, with local specificities.

Seen thus, Latin America is worth a specific look which would enable “a prospect for renewal of the theoretical approaches” in order to analyse “the regional dimension of the new international regulations” between internationalization, regionalization and the integration of policies from elsewhere in rural territories.

Firstly, this paper briefly describes the characteristics of Latin American RTD policies and the temporality of their emergence (2). Then, it will express the sense of dissatisfaction with the approach in terms of “globalization” for the policy process and the need to reinject the political variable into the analysis, notably by bringing together world politics and the analysis of public policies (3). Lastly, the issue of Latin American specificity will be raised: Can one not see a very particular regionalization process developing there, namely bottom up regionalization through sectoral policies that are themselves derived from international circulation of public policy paradigms and instruments (4).

#### **POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONTEXTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THE APPROACH**

This research is taking place in a context of strong challenges surrounding the future of the rural world, illustrated here by the case of Latin America, that are fuelling the scientific literature as much as the international expert debates: i) the challenge of the future of agricultural production in a context of uncertainties concerning world food security, and global, climatic and economic changes; ii) the challenge of competition between development models for rural zones: competitiveness of production intended for world agricultural markets versus the sustainable rural development of territories and poverty alleviation for small

farmers; iii) the challenge of the desectorization of policies supposed to be integrated with each other for global management of rural territories (environment + agrarian development + escape from poverty).

In order to contribute to an understanding of these phenomena, this research project deals with the issue of constructing and internationally circulating development policy models proposing methods for the integrated and territorialized governance of these challenges, and more especially the issue of producing or regionally adapting public policy models.

The economic context is marked by the social and economic impacts of liberalizing agricultural policies, whose perverse effects particularly affect peasant and family farmers, who have to adapt to the demands of increasingly competitive and standardized supply chains (Losch et al, 2011; Berdegue & Fuentealba, 2011). The regions with a high concentration of family or peasant agriculture are thus among the most vulnerable and are often marginalized.

The social challenges are, for their part, those of poverty alleviation and the fight against inequalities through support to family agricultures, capacity building for stakeholders and organizations involved in family agriculture and forestry management, particularly through support for the participation of local populations in decision-making and in the management of public actions.

Lastly, the environmental challenges in Latin America are concentrated on the adaptation and validation of instruments to promote environmental service and, in particular, their application for implementing more environment- and biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices.

In order to try and moderate or reverse these trends, several Latin American countries opt for territorial rural development policies. The declared objective is both to rebalance marginalized rural zones and utilize the specific attributes of rural territories by concentrating strategic productive investments and by strengthening the abilities of stakeholders to take action and reach decisions by way of systems for the organized participation of civil society (Velut, 2007; 2008; Sabourin & Teixeira, 2002).

The political context of these rural development and environment reforms is very specific to Latin America and it is one of the objectives of this project to more effectively decipher the various processes: i) it involves policies with often dissimilar ambitions and dimensions, but which are formally integrated with each other within the territories, ii) these policies have primarily international, plural origins and are applied in an interlocking dynamic process (model transfers, etc.). These transfers are operated by States (primarily Brazil here) and by international and inter-American institutions, particularly IICA and the FAO, more recently CEPAL, which have also helped to adapt territorial development instruments set in place in Europe via European structural funds, iii) But global governance is not limited to a mere globalization logic. This project also deals with globalization in the sense of recent attempts to manage “problems” through a global or integrated approach (and no longer sectoral). The territorial rural development approach, thus qualified as sustainable and participatory, thus finds itself required to propose the integration of these different sectoral instruments, namely decentralization, state devolution, territorial development, environmental conservation and poverty alleviation, or even education and healthcare in rural areas (Sabourin, 2007).

For the more modest States, those which through their small size have not had to undertake decentralization (Central America) or those who have launched it with a view to sub-national regionalization different from the territorial approach (Andean countries), this new adaptation is complex. Some instruments and regional platforms are thus set in place to support the institutionalization of these new dynamics, generally by reutilizing resources from international or bilateral cooperation, or even new cycles of policy transfers. This is the case of the ECADERT platform in Central America, and the PROCISUR programme in the countries of the southern cone.

Lastly, globalization occurs in the sense of an increasing overlapping of the levels for managing these problems: inter/transnational/regional, national, territorial.

The challenge is therefore to understand by what processes the governments of the Latin American States have tried, almost concomitantly, over the 1990-2000 period, to satisfy both these international injunctions and strong claims from social, rural and environmental movements, by inventing hybrid forms of environmental and territorial development policies.

## 2. CHARACTERISTICS AND TEMPORALITY OF RTD POLICIES IN LATIN AMERICA AND PARALLELISM OF NATIONAL AGENDAS

Between the end of the 1990s and 2011, Latin America saw the dissemination of a frame of reference and instruments for territorial development, notably rural (see table 1).

The ingredients for this parallelism in national agendas arising from a “model” are as follows:

a/ Frame of reference: endogenous and sustainable development of territories, participation of territorial stakeholders.

b/ Instruments: national and regional planning, territorial zoning, territorial participatory committees and integrated management (rural development, poverty alleviation, public health, education, etc.), credit attributed by projects.

This ‘model’ is a hybridization of several influences: democratic transitions which have opened up windows of opportunity to local social movements, notably indigenous, conditionalities linked to project funding by IOs (notably WB and its push for decentralization), continental organizations, which through their interest in small-scale agriculture, have focused on rural development, and the European model of structural funds, notably the LEADER programme. There can be no doubt about the dissemination of a Latin American model. However, while some countries have been the subject of very detailed research on the implementation of these frames of reference and instruments, notably Brazil (Sabourin, E, Teixeira, 2002; Sabourin, 2007), there has not been any attempt to understand the set of processes involved: circulation of the model and consequences of its establishment on the continent. This paper proposes an analytical framework.

**Table 1. Territorial rural development policies in Latin America**

Country	Policy	Law	Date
Argentina	Programa Federal de Apoyo al Desarrollo Rural Sustentable ProFeder <i>Programa Nacional de Apoyo al Desarrollo de los Territorios</i> PNADT		2003 2006
Brazil	PRONAT-PDSTR PTC Territories of Citizenship		2003 2008
Chile	INDEPA Política Regional y territorial SECODIR (Ministère intérieur) Programa de Desarrollo Territorial Indígena (PDTI).		2000 2006 2008
Colombia	Creation INCODER (en el Ministerio de agricultura) Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2010-2014 Prosperidad para Todos	Ley 388/97 ordenam terr rural Ley 1152	1997 2007 2009
Costa Rica	INDER GAT	Ley Fomento Producción Agropecuaria FODEA y Orgánica del MAG	1995 2006 2010
El Salvador	Red Solidaria		2002
Mexico	PRONASOL  Consejo Mexicano para el Desarrollo Rural Sustentable	Ley de Desarrollo Rural Sustentable	1990 2001 2008
Uruguay	Programa de Mesas de Fomento Rural (Ministerio ganaderia y Agricultura)	Ley 18.308 odrenamiento territorial y desarrollo sostenible	2010 2011

### 3. READING THE CIRCULATION OF NORMS: THE EXAMPLE OF RTD

An initial section deals with the limitations of the approach in terms of globalization in Latin America (3.1). A second section shows that, in effect, beyond the effects of the globalization of trade, political and social phenomena complicate the PP internationalization process (3.2).

#### 3.1. THE LIMITATIONS OF “GLOBALIZATION”: MOVING BEYOND THE POSTULATE OF DOMINATION OF THE POLITICAL BY THE ECONOMIC

This section sets out the reasons for choosing to relativize “globalization”, whose approach remains too solely concentrated on the globalization of national economies (Robinson, 2008; Gwynne & Kay, 1999; Harr & Jerry, 2008; Gilpin, 2001).

Beyond this relatively monolithic take on the evolutions of the world (“hyperglobalist”), a second aspect calls even more for it to be relativized: its economicism. Starting from the observation that the increase in international trade<sup>2</sup> in agriculture, services and industry permits the reorganization of national and local economies, along with specialization in export supply chains (specifically for LA: Robinson, 2008, chap. 2 & 3), it is as though this literature “naturally” extended its conclusions to all sectors and institutions, notably political.

<sup>2</sup> The following definitions illustrate this: ‘operations within an integral whole’ since ‘truly global services know no internal boundaries, can be offered throughout the globe, and pay scant attention to national aspects’ (O’Brien, 1992 : 5); ‘ever closer integration of national markets on a world scale’ (Sachwald, 2002).



The ultimate consequence is that of a “homogenized world of global firms” (Gwynne, 1999: 8). This literature therefore takes it more or less explicitly for granted:

- that the economic governs the political and the social; the internationalization of capitalism governs the world politically and renders it uniform (Robinson, 2008: 17).
- that the “fit between ideas and institutions” (M. Weber) places international organizations in agreement with the neoliberal approach to the world; those organizations automatically integrate the precepts of economic and financial trade (Robinson, 2008: 17).

Consequently, the literature on globalization emphasizes:

1) the impact, “pressures” or “penetration” of the global in the national (Davila Aldas, 2011:39–50). This *liberal world order*” would seem to imply “integral restructuring and global integration in each national economy” (Robinson, 2008 :18). The same applies for the subState scales which are “increasingly integrated in the global market” (Gwynne & Kay, 1999:19). Moreover, the literatures of Marxist and liberal leanings seem to agree on these two postulates: the unilateral penetration process and domination of the economic over the political.

2) In this perspective, *Transnational States* (TNS) are considered as simple domestic adapters to the new economic conditions: they adopt compliant fiscal and monetary policies; they provide the basic infrastructures for international trade; they provide stability and social order (Robinson, 2008: 33–36; see also *The State in a Changing World*, WB report on world development in 1997 and its slogan “globalization begins at home”). Deregulation policies and policies for the recomposition of capital/labour relations would apparently be the proof of this.

3) The same applies for regional integrations which would seem to be a simple instrument for accompanying economic globalization which “would make it more bearable at national level” (Sachwald, 1997: 260) or “should facilitate integration in the globalization process” as would seem to be the case for the regional spaces of Latin America established as “walkways towards globalization” of the economy (Nicolas, 1997 : 300 ; Robinson, 2008: 195 and following).

4) Lastly, according to this paradigm, national elites do not seem to be just simple relays for ‘globalization’. Robinson (2008) sees in the Latin American ‘polyarchy’ an instrument for promoting what he calls the oxymoron of the *market democracy* and of the regionalization process. The expression of “TNS agents” (Robinson, 2008: 196) is indicative of this representation of the role of the administrative elites in globalization. This “polyarchy” has forged itself as a capitalist transnational elite (Robinson, 2008: 18 –29) based on a logic of “cross-border strategic alliances” (Robinson, 2008 :30), or as a ‘transnational business community’ organized in transnational networks (Kentor, 2005: 30 ). The general conclusion of this literature is, ultimately, that this “new elite has constructed and imposed a free market and democracy paradigm” (Robinson, 2006: 97; Gwynne & Kay, 1999:18).

### **3.2. INTERNATIONALIZED AND INCREMENTAL POLICY MAKING: BRINGING TOGETHER WORLD POLITICS AND THE ANALYSIS OF POLICIES AND PUBLIC ACTION**

The observation of RTD PPs in Latin America calls for a relativization of “global governance” by reinjecting the political challenges, notably national and sub-national, into the analysis.

While we endorse the findings of the literature on *world politics* in the 1990s, rather than ‘governance’ and ‘globalization’, we shall speak here of a fragmented and trans/internationalized and regionalized incremental construction of PPs.

In describing the RTD *policy process*, which does not come directly from the logic of the globalization of production and finance, the analysis actually delves into political logics other than just economic “pressure”: transfers, internationalization and regional dissemination of models, but also a phenomenon of “bottom up” regionalization and of bilateral relations, in brief, an overlapping of actual political processes.

Beyond the parameter of the pressure of economic flows on States and economic players, the approach in terms of *world politics* has fine-tuned and expanded the tools for analysing the move from a ‘state-centred state’ to a ‘multi-centric world’ (Rosenau, 1997: 66). It crossanalyses many more parameters, notably those of paramount importance for the two

policies observed: ‘proliferation of players’, ‘emergence of interdependent solutions’, ‘State weakness’, ‘diffusion of poverty in the developing world’ (Rosenau, 1977: 66). This literature also emphasizes the fragmentation of the international arenas and the complexity of their organizational architecture (Biermann et al., 2009). Along the lines of Risse–Kappen (1995: 6), we shall start out from the postulate of the overlapping of these processes: national, intergovernmental, inter and transnational, regional, continental and territorial. As also pointed out by Rosenau, “global” and “local” logics (even though we do not adopt these terms) go hand in hand. For his part, Kehoane (2002) spoke of a theory of the complex interdependence of inter-State, transnational “multiple channels in relations”. To do this, referring again to Risse–Kappen, it is a matter of going beyond binary considerations (national/international, national-State/global, etc.) by adopting theoretical and empirical tools making it possible to read the overlapping of the processes mentioned in order to empirically decipher the “degrees of international institutionalism, i.e. sectoral regulation through bilateral agreements, multilateral regimes or international organizations”. Moravcsik (1993: 5) proposed incorporating the theories of domestic politics and of international politics in what he called liberal inter–governmentalism. Likewise, Risse–Kappen et al (1999) proposed understanding internationalization through the “socialization of international norms in domestic practices”.

The analysis of *policy processes* is also an ideal base for observing recompositions of policies and public action, notably their internationalization. Beyond the finding of a move “from national to transnational PPs” (Hassenteufel, 2008 :16), the same findings have been established for around twenty years: the “galloping demography” of public action operators (Massardier, 2008) and the fragmentation of powers – international, territorial, private, public, expert, political (Rosenau, 1997: 99 and following; Camau, Massardier, 2009). These elements call for a re-reading of the PP production process: “collective construction of public action”, which calls for a “contextualized analysis of interactions of multiple players overlapping on several levels, from local to international and including the European Union, making it possible to consider the transformations of contemporary states” (Hassenteufel, 2008: 23). Reading via the “joint” (Duran, 1999) and overlapping construction between levels of action, hence necessarily incremental (according to Lindblom’s now time-honoured concept, 1959), is thereby reinforced. It is precisely on the complexity of the overlapping of processes observed in Latin America that will depend the enigma to be solved through research on the circulation and implementation of RTD policies on the Latin American continent.

#### 4. OVERLAPPING METHODS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION AND REGIONALIZATION THROUGH A BOTTOM UP SECTORAL POLICY WITHOUT INTEGRATION

The internationalization processes for environmental and rural territorial development policies in Latin America are of three types (4.1) that allow us to tick off the hypothesis of atypical regionalization: it would seem to be without integration but based on the dissemination of a bottom up sectoral policy (4.2).

##### 4.1. TRANSFER FROM A COUNTRY OR AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION TO ANOTHER COUNTRY

This is the case for territorial development, which has been an important political and policy challenge in Latin America since the mid-1990s. The trigger was the circulation of the European “model” of structural funds, in three ways. Firstly, within the intergovernmental framework of Mercosur, the creation of the *Fondo para la Convergencia Estructural del Mercosur* (FOCEM) in 2005 directly inspired from the European structural funds. Likewise, in 2004, Mercosur created a *Foro Consultativo de Municipios, Estados Federativos, Provincias y departamentos del Mercosur* along the lines of the EU Regions Committee. It should also be noted that the creation of the rural development territories in Brazil was concomitant with these two Mercosur initiatives (2004). Moreover, the Brazilian expert and/or scholarly literature establishes this link by seeking a remedy for (non)existing political dissatisfactions

in the model of the European Structural Funds (Posada, 2008), concurring, in doing so, with the logic of PP model importing described by Rose (1991). This parallelism of agenda is therefore worth investigating to more effectively establish the conditions of EU–Mercosur and EU–Brazil transfers. As highlighted by H. Théry (2009) and G. Coufignal (2010: 105), the relations between the EU and Latin America in these fields (decentralized cooperation, cooperation for development) “are important and unclear”. In addition, in the case of territorial development policies in Latin America, the involvement of the European Community in transferring the model of the Leader programme (Champetier; 2003; De Janvry & Sadoulet, 2004, Misialkowska, 2006; Théry, 2009) was relayed via the sectoral agencies (FAO, IBRD, IFAD) then the sectoral continental or inter-American regional agencies: CEPAL (2010; 2011), particularly the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) which plays a leading role in the matter, and various networks or programmes: ECADERT, PROTERRITORIOS, PROCISUR, DTR/RIMISP, (Sepulveda et al 2003; Miranda & Tiburcio, 2010). These initiatives were transferred to the inter-American scale by IDB, IICA and FAO.

Secondly, the European Structural Funds model was transferred under the influence of national cooperation policies (notably Spanish<sup>3</sup> and French<sup>4</sup>, relays of the European model). In the case of Bolivia and Peru, for example, the programmes funded by the countries of the European Union (Denmark which opened an Embassy in Bolivia specially devoted to these projects, Padep programme for Germany and GTZ) promote, as in Brazil, a model of integrated territorial development policy, combining an injunction of decentralized governance of PP projects, support for food security, participatory policy, project monitoring instruments; international organizations participate in the same project trajectory, notably the WB (Valderrama, 2004).

Lastly, another type of transfer, intercontinental this time, has been implemented in Latin America: an effect of “model” feedback that is specifically Latin American, notably on the part of Brazil whose experience in the Sustainable Territorial Rural Development Programme is closely watched by the other Latin American countries. In the case of Brazil and Argentina, innovation in the field of rural development is reflected in the territorialization of a policy that is both sectoral (family agriculture) and with an integrating vocation (sustainable development and poverty alleviation) (CEPAL, 2001). Under the influence of an innovating Brazil, a large number of Latin American countries have tried out the integrated territorialization of PPs, notably in rural zones affected by poverty and the rural exodus. This type of transfer seems to correspond to what the literature on policy transfers qualifies as “bandwagoning”, a phenomenon of imitating neighbouring countries’ policies by tagging along (Waltz, 1979).

Three conclusions can be drawn from these few elements. On the one hand, the great diversity of processes in play: various types of transfers of a model (between Europe and States, between States) transnationalization, but also intergovernmentalism in a logic of clearly understood State logics (on the part of Spain and France, but also on the part of a country like Brazil).

This process therefore operates through production/dissemination under the influence of transnational arenas, notably networks of researchers and experts, and of “transnational configurations” (Hassenteufel, 2008: 134; Dumoulin, 2010 ). The case of RTD would seem to resemble that of environmental policies. Various authors confirm a dissemination by international regimes (Bretmeier et al, 2011). It is accepted that one of the specificities of these policies is their technicality linked to the scientific uncertainties surrounding the major debates (sustainable development, climate change, ecological modernization, water pollution standards, etc.), which have been taken up by some experts who have constructed or have

---

<sup>3</sup> See the different reports of the AGENCIA ESPAÑOLA DE COOPERACIÓN INTERNACIONAL PARA EL DESARROLLO (AECID).

<sup>4</sup> For example: Mission des chambres de commerce et d’industries en Amérique Latine ( Champetier, 2003) or the San Jose Workshop on ‘rural territorial development policies’ organized and funded by CIRAD, an international scientific player and broker of public policy paradigms, 21–25 November 2011 (CIRAD, Université Autonome, CINPE).



called upon international arenas geared towards these challenges (Meyer et al, 1997). These relatively autonomous entities, between national and inter/transnational, ensure the circulation and dissemination of ideas, causes (biodiversity, ecosystem, etc.) and of PP instruments that are readapted and then nationally “politicized”, as is the case of Payments for Environmental Services. In this respect, the support given to the programmes by the IOs (especially the WB) has been decisive (FAO, 2004; Karsenty, 2004).

#### 4.2. REGIONALIZATION<sup>5</sup>.

Mercosur is attempting to supra-nationalize some PPs, infrastructures, energy, but also in recent times, territorial policies, with the founding of FOCEM and the direct transfer of “structural funds”, the European big brothers. This is the embryo of regional territorial policies, to which needs to be added the initiative of the PROCISUR programme (which brings together the agricultural research institutions of the 6 southern cone countries) which marginally integrates territorial development concerns. For Central America some regionalization attempts can be found through sectoral regional organizations, including for the environment and territorial development (SICA, ECADERT). It would also seem that this is a deliberate strategy on the part of the Latin American states, judging from the example of the Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America (IIRSA) derived from the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) created in 2008, which, too, remains a barely supranationalized organization (Rouquié, 2011).

We note in the literature concerning the EU a type of Europeanization that can easily be transposed to the Latin American case: “bottom up” Europeanization (Baisnée and Pasquier, 2007; Pasquier & Weisbein, 2004 ). Some authors note that in Latin America too, territories are not merely sponges soaking up the imperatives of economic globalization (Meyer, 2009) but would also seem to be places of “reappropriation” (Meyer, 2009: 155). Bottom up regionalization also prizes the aspirations of rural social movements for reform and the pressing claims of those left behind by economic and agricultural growth. In addition, some work on regionalization in Latin America had already pinpointed the fact that regionalization cannot be summed up as international dynamics alone, but that it is also necessary to consider the ability of the economic and academic elites in particular to deal with issues in arenas that extend beyond State boundaries and international institutions (Dabène, 2009). To this need to be added the international strategies of territorial collectivities which also implement “por abajo” sub-national international strategies.

Basing ourselves on earlier surveys (notably the PROPOCID 2010 report) we find that the political models transferred to Latin America are reinterpreted and readapted according to specific national or regional challenges, though always with reference to the European territorial development model of structural funds and the LEADER or LEADER+ programmes. International circulation of models does not mean there is convergence or homogenization of those policies.

There appears, here, one of the main hypotheses of this paper on Latin American regionalization: looking back over the last fifteen years, it is possible to see continental regionalization mechanisms for sectoral policies. While there may be international organizations (IICA for example which is answerable to the OAS), they are appendages of IOs and have freed themselves from the intergovernmentalist will of States. This could correspond to the *spill over* phenomenon, described for European construction: regionalization would seem to become all the more efficient as it manages to gain skills by circumventing intergovernmentalism. The working hypothesis is therefore as follows: while Latin American regional international organizations are struggling to regionalize PPs through a lack of supranationalization and excessive jealous surveillance by States favouring

---

<sup>5</sup> The Latin American process is intentionally less integrated since it is only geared towards constructing a market between certain countries of Latin America. Its supranational nature is marginal to the benefit of ‘intergovernmentality’, which would seem, moreover, to be detrimental to its efficiency and be the cause of numerous impediments (Rouquié, 2011, Mazet, 2009 ; Posada, 2009 ; Dabène, 2009)

intergovernmentalism (Girault, 2009; Dabène 2009), the policy model we are studying would seem to extend over the continent, partly escaping the States.

It is a matter here of proposing a hypothesis of the existence of a specific and novel mode of regionalization in Latin America: it consists in producing a regional unit through the bottom up dissemination and adoption of policies through the sectoral driving forces (such as IICA) of classic IOs and/or NGOs and/or bilateral cooperation and/or PP transfers, which all goes to produce a highly sectoral Latin American regionalization process via PP internationalization. It is then possible to speak of a regionalization process without regional integration, even though the latter is not totally absent from this regionalization.

## **5. CONCLUSION: ANALYSING THE SECTORAL COALITION OF RTD REGIONALIZATION IN LATIN AMERICA**

The methodology proposed to analyse this phenomenon, in relation with the reading of the overlapping of processes (cf. sections 3.2 and 4.1), and with the junction between the world politics approach and the analysis of policies and public actions approach, is to reconstruct some Latin American configurations that display it.

By public policy coalition we mean a network of stakeholders (from the most international to the most territorial) that is more or less open/closed (Marsh, Smith, 2000; “Network as groups and boundaries”, Considine, Lewis, Alexander, **2009**) and multilevel (Bache, Flinders, 2004; Lazega, Jourdana, Mounier, 2007; Dumoulin 2010) whose members guide policy making and policy implementation, and share a common representation (Sabatier, Jenkins-Smith, 1993, Boscarino, 2009). These coalitions may comprise elected representatives, technocratic experts and consultants, donor IOs or NGOs, representatives of agricultural or industrial interests, etc., activists (ecologists, fishermen, sometimes producer communities, etc.). Methodologically, these coalitions are reconstituted by way of a quantitative analysis (stakeholder centrality indices, measurement of interactions between them, analysis of relevant political, expert and activist resources, etc. for joining and acting within the coalition (Sanstrom, Carlsson, 2008; Considine, Lewis, Alexander, 2009) and a qualitative analysis (textual analysis of discourse, analysis of stakeholder trajectories).

It is therefore a matter of identifying stakeholders who, from territories to IOs/NGOs and including national bureaucracies, form coalitions and enable the circulation and reappropriation of terms of reference and instruments of this public policy and the parallelism of national agendas on the subject.

## **6. BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Bache I., Flinders M. (eds), *Multi-Level Governance*, Oxford University Press, 2004
- Bonnal, P. 2010 Production des politiques et compromis institutionnels autour du Développement Durable (programme ADD édition 2006) : compte-rendu de fin de projet Montpellier : CIRAD ,39 p. , Projet ANR-06-PADD-016
- Bonnal P. et al., 2010. La production des politiques et compromis institutionnels autour du développement durable. Rapport final du projet Propocid. Paris, ANR.
- Pasquier, R. 2007, *L'Europe telle qu'elle se fait. Européanisation et sociétés politiques nationales*, Paris, CNRS Editions.
- Baylis K., Peplow S., Rausser G., Leo Simon L., 2008, Agri-environmental policies in the EU and United States: A comparison, *Ecological Economics* 65 : 753 – 764
- Berdegue J ; Fuentealba, R. 2011. Latin America: The State of Smallholders in Agriculture, IFAD , Conference on New Directions for Smallholder Agriculture, Roma, 24-25/01/2011

- Biermann F., Philipp Pattberg P., H. van Hasselt, F. Zelli, 2009, The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis, *Global Environmental Politics* 9:14–40
- Boscarino J.E., “Surfing for Problems: Advocacy Group Strategy in U.S. Forestry Policy”, *The Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2009, pp. 415-434
- Breitmeier H ; Vonderdal A ; Young O.R., 2011, The effectiveness of international Environmental Regimes : comparing and contrasting findings from quantitative research *International Studies Review*, v 13, n°4, 579–605
- Briceno-Ruiz J., 2011, From the South American Free Trade Area to the Union of South American Nations: The Transformation of a Rising Regional Process, *Latin American Policy*, v.1, n°2, p. 208–229
- Camau M. ; Massardier G. (dir.), 2009, *démocratie et autoritarisme. Hybridation et fragmentation des pouvoirs*, Paris, Karthala.
- CEPAL, 2010, *Panorama del desarrollo territorial en América Latina y el Caribe*, Santiago de Chile, CEPAL Colección Documentos de proyectos
- Considine M., Lewis J. M., Alexander D., *Networks, Innovation and Public Policy. Politicians, Bureaucrats and the Pathways to Change Inside Government*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009
- Champetier, Y 2003 La Estrategia de Microregiones: une nouvelle stratégie de lutte contre la pauvreté dans les territoires les plus en difficulté du Mexique Washington D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Couffignal G., 2010, « Les relations UE–AL : simple routine ou prolégomènes d’une politique étrangère européenne ? », *Mondes Emergents*, « Amérique Latine. Une Amérique Latine toujours plus diverse », La Documentation Française, p. 99–112
- Christiansen T., “Restructuring European Space: From territorial Politics to Multi-Level Governance”, UE Working Paper, Robeert Shuman Center 96/53, European University Institute
- Dabène O., 1997, *La region Amérique Latine*, Presses de Sciences Po
- Dabene O. 2009. *The Politics of Regional Integration in Latin America: Theoretical and Comparative Explorations* , New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dávila Aldàs F., 2011, America Latina y la globalización, *Revista de Relaciones Internacionales*, n° 101–102, 208: 33–56
- De Janvry A. ; Sadoulet E. 2004, Toward a territorial approach to rural development: International experiences and implications for Mexico’s Microregions Strategy, University of California at Berkeley
- Delpeuch T., 2009, Comment la mondialisation rapproche les politiques publiques, *L’Économie politique*, 2009/3 n° 43 : 77–99
- Dolowitz D., Marsh D., 2000, Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making. *Governance—an International Journal of Policy Administration and Institutions* 13 : 5–24
- Dowbor L., 2011, Intellectual in a Network. A New Generation Faces the Challenges of Development, *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 38, n°3 : 78–98
- Dri C.F., 2011, Limits of the Institutional Mimesis of the European Union: The Case of the Mercosur Parliament, *Latin American Policy*, vol.1, n°1 : 52–74
- Dumoulin D., 2010, Configurations sociales transnationales : quelles compétences pour les passeurs d’échelles ? Exemples des politiques de la conservation de la nature. La fabrique multi-niveaux des politiques. Les passeurs d’échelles, colloque international « Les approches “ multi-niveaux “ des politiques publiques, CIRAD. Montpellier. 6–10/09/2010
- Duran P., 1999, *Penser l’action publique*, LGDJ
- Evans M., 2009, Policy transfer in critical perspective, *Policy Studies* 30 : 243–68
- Evans M., Davies J, 1999, Understanding policy transfer: A multi-level, multi-disciplinary perspective, *Public Administration* 77:361–385.
- FAO. 2004. *Payment Schemes for Environmental Services in Watersheds. Land and Water Discussion Paper* n°. 3, Rome, FAO
- Gwynne R.N., Kay C., 1999, *Latin America Transformed. Globalization and Modernity*, Arnold, Oxford University Press

- Giddens A., 1990, *The Consequences of Modernity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Polity Press, Stanford University Press
- Gilpin R., 2001, *Global Political Economy*, Princeton University Press
- Girault, C. 2009. Intégration et coopération régionale en Amérique du Sud dans C. Girault (ed.), *L'intégration en Amérique du Sud*, Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, p. 39–61
- Hassenteufel P., 2008, *Sociologie de l'Action Publique*, Paris, Armand Colin
- Hawkins D.G., Hall D.A., Nielson D.L., Tierney M.J. (eds), 2009, *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- HOOGHE Liesbet, MARKS Gary, 2001, *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*, Bruxelles et New-York, Inc. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- HOOGHE Liesbet, MARKS Gary, 2002, « The Types of Multi-Level Governance », *Cahiers européens de Sciences Po*, 3
- Kehoane R., 2002, *Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*, Routledge
- Kentor J., 2005, "The growth of transnational Corporate Network", 1962–1998, *Journal of World System Research*, vol. 11, n°2
- Kentor J., Jang Y. S., 2004, "Yes, there is a (Growing) Transnational Business Community", *International Sociology*, vol. 19, n°3
- Kohler-Koch B., Larat F., 2000, La dissémination du modèle communautaire de gouvernance comme processus d'adoption et d'adaptation, *Politiques européennes*, n° 2 : 87–106
- Kohler-Koch B., 1995, *The transformation of governance in Europe*, Routledge
- Lazega E., Jourda M., Mounier L., « L'analyse de réseaux multi-niveaux : Une étude de cas. », *Revue française de sociologie*, 2007
- Lindblom C.E., 1959, "The Science of 'Muddling Through'", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 79–88
- Lopez Diaz M., 2008, El analisis de redes sociales. Una herramienta explicativa para la comprension de las relaciones internacionales, *Revista de Relaciones Internacionales*, n° 101–102 : 73–98
- Losch B., Fréguin-Gresh S. and E. White, (2011), *Rural Transformation and Late Developing Countries in a Globalizing World. A Comparative Analysis of Rural Change. Final Report of the RuralStruc Program, Revised Version*. Washington, DC: World Bank
- Massardier G., 2008, *Politiques et action publiques*, Armand Colin, collection U
- Massardier G., 2011, Des transferts de politiques publiques en eaux troubles méditerranéennes. Les arrangements territorialisés de la gestion de l'eau, *Pôle Sud*, n° 35
- McGrew A., « Globalization and Global Politics », in Baylis J., Smith S., Owens P., *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford University Press, Fifth Edition, 2011
- Meyer J. W., 1997, "The Structuring of a World Environmental Regime, 1870–1990", *International Organization*, Vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 623–651
- Miranda C ; Tiburcio (Coord) 2010. Políticas de Desenvolvimento Territorial Rural no Brasil Avanços e Desafios, Brasília, IICA Brasil, 26p
- Miranda, M., et coll. 2003. *The Social Impacts of Payments for Environmental Services in Costa Rica. A Quantitative Field Survey and Analysis of the Virilla Watershed*, Londres, Institut international pour l'environnement et le développement (IIED)
- Morales I., 2011, "Contentious Strategies for Stimulating Development in the Region: From National Models to Regional Paradigms", *Latin American Policy*, vol.2, n°1, p. 72–84
- Moravcsik A., 1997,, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics", *International Organisation*, Vol.51, n°4, automne 1997, pp. 513–553.
- Musiakowska, I. 2006. Transfer of the European Regional Policy to Latin America , European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), Colchester, University of Essex
- Nicolas F., 1997, « Mondialisation et régionalisation dans les pays en développement. Les deux face de Janus », N° spécial de Politique Etrangère, N°2, p. 293–306
- O'Brien, 1992, *Global financial integration/ the end of geography*, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, 1992
- Pasquier R, Guigner S, Cole A. 2011, *Dictionnaire des politiques territoriales*, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po

- Pasquier R., 2002 L'européanisation par le bas : les régions et le développement territorial en France et en Espagne », in J. Fontaine, P. Hassenteufel, *To change or not to change ? Le changement de l'action publique à l'épreuve du terrain*, Presses Universitaires de Rennes,
- Pasquier, 2004 *La capacité politique des régions. Une comparaison France/Espagne*, Préface d'Yves Mény, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Pasquier, R. ; Weisbein J. 2004, L'Europe au microscope du local. Manifeste pour une sociologie politique de l'intégration communautaire, *Politique européenne*, n°12, p. 5-21
- Perrot-Maître D., 2006. The Vittel payments for ecosystem services: a "perfect" PES case? London, UK, International Institute for Environment and Development. 24 p.
- Posada E. V., 2009, « les scénarios d'intégration sud-américains », dans Christian Girault (ed.), *L'intégration en Amérique du Sud*, Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2009, p. 121-132
- Richard R, 1991. "What Is Lesson-Drawing?" *Journal of Public Policy* 11:3-30
- Risse-Kappen T., 1995, *Bringing transnational relations back in. Non-state actors, domestic structures and international institutions*, Cambridge University Press
- Robinson W.I., 2006,, « Promoting Polyarchy in Latin America : The Oxymoron of 'Market Democracy' », in Eric Hershberg, Fred Rosen, *Latin America After Neoliberalism. Turning the Tide in the 21st Century?*, Nacla, 2006, p. 96-119
- Robinson W.I., 2008, *Latin America and Global Capitalism. A Critical Globalization Perspective*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Rosenau J.N. 1997, *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier. Exploring governance in a Turbulent World*, Cambridge University Press, 1997
- Rosenau J.N., 1995, *Thinking Theory Thoroughly: Coherent Approaches To an Incoherent World*, Westview Press, 1995
- Rose, R., 1991, "What Is Lesson-Drawing?", *Journal of Public Policy*, 11:3-30
- Rouquié, A. 2011, "L'amérique Latine dans un ordre mondial en mutation", *Mondes émergents*, « Amérique Latine. L'Amérique Latine est bien partie », La Documentation Française, p. 15-27
- Sabourin E. 2007, Les débats de politique agricole et de développement rural dans le Brésil de Lula, in *Lusotopie* n° XIV-2 : 61-85,
- Sabourin, E ; Teixeira O. (Edit) (2002) Planification du développement territorial au Brésil Actes du séminaire, 28-30 septembre 1999, Cirad, Ufpp, Montpellier, Colloques, 116p.
- Sabatier P. A., Jenkins-Smith H.C., *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*, Westview Press, 1993
- Sachwald F., 1997, « La mondialisation comme facteur d'intégration régionale », N° spécial de Politique Etrangère, N°2, p. 257-276
- Sachwald F., 2002, *Réactions et réponses à la mondialisation. Mondialisation, innovation et inégalités*, Les notes de l'IFRI, n° 48
- Sandström A., Carlsson L., "The Performance of Policy Networks: The Relation between Network Structure and Network Performance", *The Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 4, 2008, pp. 497-524
- Saunier, P.Y., 2004. "Circulations, connexions et espaces transnationaux" *Genèse*:110-126
- Schleyer, C. & Plieninger T. 2011. Obstacles and options for the design and implementation of payment schemes for ecosystem services provided through farm trees in Saxony, Germany *Environmental Conservation* 38 (4): 454-463
- Segovia A., 2006, *Integración real y grupos de poder economic en America central: Implicaciones para la democracia y el desarrollo en la Region*, San Jose, Costa Rica, Fondation Friedrich Ebert America central, 2006
- Sepulveda S; Rodriguez A.; Echeverri R.; Portilla M. 2003. El enfoque territorial de desarrollo rural, San José, C.R. : IICA, 180 p.
- Shipan C.R., Volden C., 2008, "The Mechanisms of Policy Diffusion." *American Journal of Political Science* 52:840-857
- Scholte J. A., 2000, *Globalization : A Critical Introduction*, McMillan



- Théry H., 2009, « Les relations bilatérales décentralisées France-Brésil dans leur contexte Europe-Amérique Latine », *Mondes émergents*, « Amérique Latine. La nouvelle donne politique et économique », La Documentation Française, p. 81-104
- Tullo Vigevani T., Haroldo Romanzini H. Jr, 2011, "The Impact of Domestic Politics and International Changes on The Brazilian Perception of Regional Integration", *Latin American Politics and Society*, Vol. 53, n°1, 125-155
- Valderrama M., 2004, "Los procesos de decentralizacion en America Latina y la cooperacion europea », in José Luis Rhi-Sausi, *Desarollo local en America Latina. Logros y desoafios para la cooperacion europea*, Recal-Cespi, 2004 p. 49-62.
- Velut. S. 2007. Mondialisation et développement territorial en Amérique latine Argentine-Chili. HDR de géographie, Université Paris III Sorbonne Nouvelle.
- Velut. S. 2008, Développement et mondialisation dans le Cône Sud : le territoire en débat.in *Bulletin de l'Association de Géographes Français* 85, 3 (2008) 338-350"
- Waltz K., 1979, *Theory of International Politics*, McGraw-Hill
- Wolman H., Page E., 2002. "Policy transfer among local governments: An information-theory approach." *Governance-an International Journal of Policy and Administration* 15:477-501